



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/641,034	(08/16/2000	Toshiyuki Yoneda	BEAR-006	3757
24353	7590	01/06/2005		EXAMINER	
		0 & FRANCIS LL	WAX, ROBERT A		
SUITE 200	IIVERSITY AVE 000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EAST PALO	EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303			1653	
-				DATE MAILED: 01/06/200:	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/641,034	YONEDA ET AL.					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Robert A. Wax	1653					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 08 December 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount in the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) _ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>21-24</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.					
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen							
10. Other:	//	Cathel					
,		Robert A. Wax Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1653					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments ignore the teachings of Rowe et al. to use fragments of MEPE and focus only on the use of the full-length protein. Use of the full-length protein is neither claimed nor addressed in the rejection and is, therefore, a side issue. In any event, the evidence is not prior to the effective filing date of the instant application and can have no bearing on motivation of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The rejection is, therefore, maintained.